

CONFIDENTIAL

4 MAR 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Policy and Plans Group

FROM:

[REDACTED]
Policy and Plans Group

SUBJECT: Revision of DCID 1/20, Security Policy
Concerning Travel and Assignment of
Personnel with Access to Sensitive
Compartmented Information (SCI)

1. The Director of Security did not concur with Subject revision in a formal SECOM vote action. His disagreement was based on "serious concerns about lack of flexibility in the document." He feels Subject should contain a provision that would permit a waiver of defensive security briefings by an SOIC and avoid a literal interpretation that every traveler to a hazardous area (criteria countries and a few others) must be briefed before every trip regardless of experience or previous briefings. In PPG discussions with the Director of Security the matter of overseas briefings was raised. We did not feel that a COS or a COB should be obliged to brief or arrange for a briefing of an employee in each instance of travel, particularly operational travel. CIA voiced the only objection in the SECOM to Subject proposal and the Chairman, SECOM has urged that we concur and, at the same time, provide language we feel is necessary to gain flexibility.

2. It is apparent we are talking about travel and not assignments. We are also talking about defensive security briefings rather than risk of capture briefings. The DO resurrected the latter a couple of years ago and they exist, but in the practical sense we need be concerned only with the "Defensive Briefings" mentioned in [REDACTED] Foreign Travel and Assignments, and the "Defensive Briefing Areas" cited in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] we need not be concerned with private travel; [REDACTED] is definitive in treatment of said travel. With this narrowing of matters to be addressed, the following is recommended:

° Paragraph 4b(3) of Subject revision
(January 1983 version) be replaced as follows.
"Waivers for official travel justified by

[REDACTED]

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

immediate operational need or waivers to avoid redundancy in situations involving experienced and frequent travelers who have received previous defensive security briefings."

° Paragraphs 4b (3) and (4) be redesignated 4b(4) and (5).

3. The proposed addition would represent an extension of SOIC authority and is consistent [redacted]

25X1

[redacted] The only change that might be appropriate would be to establish a time limit for the "validity" of a Defensive Briefing [redacted] as was done with Hostile Audio Surveillance Briefings (3 years). I would recommend against this. [redacted] now provides the Director of Security with authority to waive a Defensive Briefing on a case by case basis and I believe this is proper and certainly supportive of flexibility.

4. Attached is a proposed memorandum to the Chairman, SECOM from the Director of Security. Should the suggested addition be voted down by the SECOM membership, it is recommended that we accept the majority view. As evidenced by Mr. Paschal's commentary included in basic material, the SECOM staff considers the Subject revision open-ended in terms of implementation by an SOIC. Although Mr. Paschal missed the point in referring to "how" instead of "when" briefings will be administered, he is correct in noting we can do just about anything in the way of implementation unless something is specifically mandated or forbidden. With reference to our suggested addition, specificity would be desirable; it is not, however, essential. In the SCI world, we are given broad definitions of sin and an enjoiner to avoid it. For better or worse we are not told how to be virtuous.

25X1

ALL PORTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT
ARE CLASSIFIED CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL